



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,744	07/20/2000	HISAYOSHI SHIMIZU	2501US0P	1419

23115 7590 10/18/2002

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INC  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
475 HALF DAY ROAD  
SUITE 500  
LINCOLNSHIRE, IL 60069

EXAMINER

PULLIAM, AMY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/600,744

Applicant(s)

SHIMIZU ET AL.

Examiner

Amy E Pulliam

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/5/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Receipt of Papers*

Receipt is acknowledged of the Request for Extension of Time, and the Request for an RCE, both received by the Office on August 5, 2002.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 8, 10, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 394 050 A2 to Ueda *et al.* Ueda *et al.* disclose a method of preparing a freeze dried preparation in which a first liquid is frozen, a second liquid is added to the frozen first liquid, and the frozen first and second liquids are freeze dried together, wherein one of the two liquids contains a pharmaceutically active compound or a preparation dissolved or suspended therein (p 11, claim 1). Ueda *et al.* further teach that the process takes place in a container (p 4, l 11). Claim 9 of the reference teaches that the liquids are frozen at temperatures of between –10 and –50°C. Example 5 of reference 1 teaches applicant's method of coating the inside of a container (vial) with ice, and then proceeding with the freeze drying steps. The teachings of Ueda *et al.* anticipate the limitations of applicant's above listed claims.

Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2002 have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that the process disclosed by the cited reference results in undesirable scattering of the product, which does not allow the product to be recovered efficiently. Applicant again relies on the Declaration of Mr. Mukai to emphasize their arguments. The examiner finds the Declaration to be unpersuasive for several reasons.

First, the declaration contains two experiments, which are asserted to be comparative experiments between applicant's claimed method and the method of the cited prior art. Upon careful examination of the experiments, the examiner notes that the only difference between the two experiments is that Example 1 uses mannitol, while example 2 uses "microcapsule powder." Otherwise, there are no differences between the two experiments. There are several problems with this comparison. First, it is not clear what applicant is using in the "microcapsule powder." This is troubling because it appears the particular material used is of great importance being that it is the variable which differs in the two experiments. Second, it appears that any differences between the two examples are due to the specific material, however, no specific material is stated in either the claims or the declaration. More specifically, if applicant's asserted unexpected results are due to the use of a particular material, then this particular material must be included as a claim limitation. As currently stated, applicant's generic claim is very broad, and remains anticipated by the teachings of Ueda *et al.*

Additionally, applicant has attempted to make the scope of the declaration commensurate with the scope of the claims by using the generic term "microcapsule powder" in the declaration. However, obviously a specific material was used in Experiment 2. This particular material needs to be stated in the Declaration. However, this then creates a problem, because the declaration is

Art Unit: 1615

no longer commensurate in scope with the generic claims, once a particular material has been inserted. This discussion is to demonstrate to applicant that the instant declaration is not supportive of the very broad claims currently pending. Applicant has asserted an unexpected result using one particular material instead of mannitol (even though that particular material is not stated in the declaration). This assertion does not extrapolate to any and all materials used in the formation of microspheres and microcapsules. It is recommended that applicant do one of two things. 1) More detailed limitations should be added to the claims, to more specifically state applicant's invention. For instance, what is it that makes applicant's claimed process different than the process of the prior art. Right now, the claims do not contain any such limitations. 2) Submit a more extensive declaration, which is commensurate in scope with the claims. If a new declaration is submitted, it is recommended that applicant include more detailed data, such as discussion of how the scattering is observed, and a statistical analysis of this data to demonstrate if the differences are significant.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 13, 14, 16, and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 394 050, as discussed above, and in view of the following comments.

Ueda *et al.* do not specifically teach that the resultant product be microcapsules. However, it is the position of the examiner that the process of freeze drying is well known in the art. This process results in a porous sheet at the bottom of the freeze drying contained. Upon scraping the sheet, a powder is formed. It is the position of the examiner that there is no patentable distinction between the resultant product of applicant and the resultant product of the cited art. Furthermore, the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicant's product with the product of the prior art in order to establish that the product of the prior art does not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is upon the applicant to prove that the claimed products are functionally different than those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. *See Ex parte Phillips*, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1302, 1303 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1993), *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ2d 1922, 1923 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int.) and *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Ueda *et al.* do not specifically disclose a layer of a water repelling substance. However, Ueda *et al.* do teach the used of at least two frozen layers of different liquids (p 3, l 55-57). Based on the generic teachings of Ueda *et al.*, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform the freeze drying process by lining a container (such as a vial) with ice, and an additional layer of a different liquid, and then proceeding with the freeze drying steps. There are no limitations in Ueda *et al.* as to what the second liquid may be. However, Ueda *et al.* do teach that one of the layers contains a pharmaceutical active suspended or dissolved therein (p 3, l 35-36). Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that if the desired active for the formulation is a hydrophobic active, then the skilled practitioner would use a hydrophobic layer

Art Unit: 1615

in addition to the ice layer. If the desired active for the formulation is hydrophilic, the skilled practitioner could place the active in the water-ice layer, or use a hydrophilic liquid as the second layer. Either way, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use either a hydrophobic or hydrophilic layer as the second layer to be frozen in the container. The expected result would be a pharmaceutically acceptable lyophilized formulation.

Additionally, the purpose of applicant's claimed invention is to supply a process with a better yield of microcapsules, with a reduced risk for entry of foreign substances. These are the same problems addressed in the Ueda *et al.* disclosure. Ueda *et al.* teach that their invention overcomes problems such as contamination, as well as faster and better recovery (p 3, l 1-35). Therefore, absent any evidence to the contrary, applicant's claimed invention achieves the same goal as that of the prior art, with no unexpected results. Therefore, this invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that the water repelling base material of applicant's claimed invention is not obviated by the reference's teachings to a second liquid. Applicant further asserts that their water repelling base materials are used as coatings for the container, and that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the listed materials are to remain in the container. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the specific materials, or the fact that the materials are to remain in the container) are

Art Unit: 1615

not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). It is recommended that applicant amend the claims to more carefully disclose their invention. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

### *Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy E Pulliam whose telephone number is 703-308-4710. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-5:00, Alternate Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 703-308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3592 for regular communications and 703-305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

A. Pulliam  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1615  
October 15, 2002

THURMAN K. PAGE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600